

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are pending with entry of this Amendment.

Please cancel Claims 5 and 7 without prejudice.

Claim 8 has been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base and intervening claims as suggested by the Office. Allowance of Claim 8 is respectfully solicited.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the patentable elements of Claims 5 and 7.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 9-14 stand rejected.

The Applicant acknowledges the approval and acceptance of the drawings submitted February 1, 2006.

The following sections address *in seriatim* the points in the office Action requiring response.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to Claims 1-14 because of several informalities. Applicant has cancelled Claims 5 and 7 without prejudice. Applicant has amended Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 to correct the informalities identified by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

At paragraph 2.1 spanning pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Office Action improperly rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,501,662 to Ikeda. While Applicant disagrees with the merits of the rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite the patentable elements of Claims 5 and 7. Applicant submits that Ikeda does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 1. Thus, the Examiner's rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Applicant's independent Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

An arrangement to accommodate power and control electronics of an electric motor (2), comprising: a first circuit board (11) mounted with control electronic components (12a-12c); a second circuit board (16) mounted with power electronic components (17) which has a substrate that not only has electrically insulating properties but also good thermal conductivity; and a cooling element (3) in thermally conductive contact with the substrate of the second circuit board (16)... (emphasis supplied)

In contrast, Ikeda discloses and teaches a circuit board arrangement having a rectangular-parallelepiped-shaped box 20 made of metal with high heat conductivity such as aluminum. This box is provided with a radiator 21 including radiating fins protruding outward. The radiator is also made of metal with high heat conductivity and forms the bottom wall of the box. Printed circuit board assemblies 30 and 40 are mounted in the box 20. *See* Ikeda at 3:35-45 and Figure 3. One printed circuit board assembly comprises a PCB 31 and a PCB32 made of insulating material and a heat conduction plate 33. The heat conduction plate 33 is adhered at one surface to the PCB 31 and at the other surface to the PCB 32. Ikeda at 3:46-55. The heat conduction plate 33 is thermally connected to the box by an L-shaped heat conduction member 61. Ikeda at 3:66-4:5. The

second printed circuit board assembly 40 is assembled in a like manner with heat conduction plate 42 and similar thermal connections. Ikeda at 4:6-14. It is clear that Ikeda teaches that the both heat conducting plates 33, 42 having PCBs adhered thereto are thermally connected to the box 20 or the radiator 21 via L-shaped elements.

In contrast, Claim 1, provides only one circuit board in thermally conductive contact with a cooling element. Thus, Ikeda does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claim 1 and, as discussed above, certainly fails to teach only one circuit board, the circuit board having power electronic components, being in thermally conductive contact with a cooling element. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are hereby solicited.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

At paragraphs 3.1 through 3.5 of the Office Action, the Office improperly rejects Claims 2-7 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of other prior art references, *e.g.*, Linden, Grauvogel, and Oka. Claims 5 and 7 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Without addressing the merits of the rejections, it is noted that Claims 2-4, 6 and 9-14 are each ultimately dependent upon independent Claim 1. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Thus, without the need to resort to the additional patentable elements contained therein, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-4, 6 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are hereby solicited.

Conclusion

This Amendment has been submitted responsive to the Office Action mailed July 2, 2007. Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 remain pending in the subject application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephonic or in-person interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Should any additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this Response, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of the same, such a petition is made and the Office is authorized to charge such fees to **Deposit Account No. 04-1679**.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark C. Comtois

Reg. No. 46,285

DUANE MORRIS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: October 2, 2007